United Nations A/C.2/72/SR.27

General Assembly
Seventy-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
19 January 2018

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 27th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 30 November 2017, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Jürgenson ..... (Estonia)

Contents

Statement by the Chair

Agenda item 16: Information and communications technologies for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*)

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*)

(d) Commodities (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*)

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (*continued*)

Agenda item 20: Implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations Conferences on Human Settlements and on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (*continued*)

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(c) Culture and sustainable development (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

17-21297 (E)

Please recycle

Agenda item 22: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 23: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(b) Women in development (*continued*)

(c) Human resources development (*continued*)

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(b) South-South cooperation for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Completion of the Committee's work

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

Statement by the Chair

1. **The Chair** drew attention to three informal conference room papers (CRPs) containing the final agreed text on cross-cutting language for inclusion where indicated in three of the draft resolutions before the Committee. The remaining draft resolution documents had been issued with the final text already reflecting cross-cutting language, where agreed. Conference room papers had been circulated to Committee members through the Second Committee module on the e-deleGATE portal the evening before and were also accessible on the Second Committee website at https://www.un.org/en/ga/second/72/proposalstatus.shtml.

Agenda item 16: Information and communications technologies for development (*continued*)
(A/C.2/72/L.5 and A/C.2/72/L.66)

Draft resolutions on information and communications technologies for sustainable development (A/C.2/72/L.5 and A/C.2/72/L.66)

2. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.66, submitted by Ms. Chanda (Zambia), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.5. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

3. **Mr. Lahrmaid** (Morocco), facilitator, said that in paragraph 2, the wording of the final version under the no-objection procedure should be retained in order to remain consistent with numerous source documents, especially the outcome document of the Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards. He also drew attention to two minor drafting changes.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.66, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

5. **Ms. Christian** (United States of America) said that, while it had joined the consensus, her delegation wished to make several points regarding the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development. The United States had already registered its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November. Her delegation wished to dissociate itself from language in the body of the draft resolution that promoted technology transfer or the distribution of intellectual property rights that were not on mutually agreed terms. For the United States, any such language would have no standing in any future negotiations. The United States continued to oppose language that it believed undermined intellectual property rights.

6. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.5 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.17/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on international trade and development (A/C.2/72/L.17/Rev.1)

7. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.17/Rev.1, submitted by Ecuador on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

8. **Mr. Kimmel** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his country could not join consensus on the draft resolution. Regarding the reference to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda in paragraph 3, much of the trade-related language in the outcome document of the third International Conference on Financing for Development had been overtaken by events since July 2015 and was immaterial. That language had no standing for ongoing work and negotiations involving trade. Indeed, some intervening events had occurred only months after the release of the outcome document. The United States was also unable to join consensus on the attempt by the General Assembly to prescribe the appropriate characteristics of international systems independent of the United Nations system. That was not a matter on which the General Assembly should opine. The World Trade Organization (WTO) was an independent organization with a different membership, mandate and rules of procedure. The United States rejected paragraph 7. It did not accept statements of the General Assembly on such economic, financial or trade measures, nor would it accept the implication by the General Assembly that such trade measures might be inconsistent with the basic principles of the World Trade Organization. The United States believed that each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries, and that included restricting trade in certain circumstances. His country was within its rights to utilize its trade and commercial policy as tools to achieve national objectives. By adopting draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.17/Rev.1, the General Assembly, in effect, would purport to limit the abilities of the international community and Member States to respond effectively

and by non-violent means against threats to democracy, human rights or peace and security.

9. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

10. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted by 167 votes to 1, with no abstentions.*

11. **Ms. Stoeva** (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, said that the States members of the European Union had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The European Union and its member States attached the greatest importance to the development and strengthening of the multilateral trading system centred around the World Trade Organization that was open, transparent, universal and rules-based. The European Union believed that only such a system fostered coherence among trade policies across the globe and allowed regional and bilateral initiatives to be mutually supportive in advancing a progressive trade agenda and the economic development of its members, especially developing countries. For that reason, it fully supported the trade-related language contained in the draft resolution.

12. **Mr. Favre** (Switzerland) said that Switzerland firmly believed in multilateralism and in the need for States Members of the United Nations to reach decisions by consensus. That was all the more important in the Second Committee, which was tasked, among other matters, with discussing implementation of the 2030 Agenda. As had been the case with the adoption of that universal Agenda, consensus should remain the rule in the Second Committee and recorded votes the exception. Switzerland stood ready to seek consensus in negotiations on draft resolutions and would continue to do so. Switzerland invited all Member States to adopt that same constructive spirit. His country regretted that certain draft resolutions had had to be put to a vote, as had occurred with draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.17/Rev.1 on international trade and development. Switzerland attached high priority to maintaining and developing the multilateral, rules-based trading system. On the path to implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals, free non-discriminatory trade could and should be part of the solution. For that reason, Switzerland had decided to support draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.17/Rev.1.

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.19/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the international financial system and development (A/C.2/72/L.19/Rev.1)

13. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.19/Rev.1, submitted by Ecuador on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The

draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

14. **Mr. Kimmel** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation regretted that it could not join consensus on the text and wished to highlight some of its concerns. With respect to the references to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, his Government had addressed its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November. Moreover, the call for scaling up international tax cooperation should not be interpreted as a call for upgrading the Committee of Experts on International Cooperation in Tax Matters. The Committee served as a sufficient venue for United Nations discussion on tax.

15. The United States was unable to agree to language that called for enhancing, ensuring or strengthening the coherence and consistency of international financial, monetary and trading systems and policies. Such language presumed that the current level of coherence and consistency was in some way suboptimal, a view his country did not necessarily share. Moreover, the United States was unable to join consensus on the attempt by the United Nations, in paragraph 2, to prescribe the appropriate characteristics of international systems independent of the United Nations system. That was not a matter on which the General Assembly should opine.

16. With respect to paragraph 14, the United States strongly disagreed with the encouragement to provide flexible, concessional, fast-disbursing and front-loaded assistance without regard to the financial sustainability of the institutions, the developmental impact and effect of poverty reduction of such assistance or the presence of an appropriate macroeconomic policy framework. Following through on such recommendations was not financially sustainable. The concessionality of assistance should be determined by the governing bodies of the international financial institutions and limited concessional resources should be allocated with reference to income and creditworthiness.

17. Furthermore, that recommendation could be read as encouraging multilateral development banks to refrain from adhering to the high social, environmental and fiduciary standards that were essential to achieving sustainable development. While his country acknowledged that the term "illicit financial flows" had been utilized in prior resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the United States generally opposed its inclusion as a term with no agreed upon international definition. Absent any common understanding of the term, greater clarity would be required about the specific underlying illegal activities that produced or contributed to such threats, such as embezzlement, bribery, money laundering or other corrupt practices or crimes.

18. Regarding unilateral economic measures, the United States believed that economic sanctions could be an appropriate, effective and legitimate alternative to the use of force. Each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries, and that included restricting trade in certain circumstances. The United States was within its rights to utilize its trade and commercial policy tools to achieve its national security and foreign policy objectives.

19. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname,

Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

20. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.19/Rev.1 was adopted by 173 votes to 1, with no abstentions.*

21. **Ms. Stoeva** (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, said that the States members of the European Union had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The European Union and its member States attached the greatest importance to the development and strengthening of the multilateral trading system centred around a World Trade Organization that was open, transparent, universal and rules-based. Only such a system fostered coherence among trade policies across the globe and allowed regional and bilateral initiatives to be mutually supportive in advancing a progressive trade agenda and the economic development of its members, especially developing countries. For that reason, it fully supported the trade-related language contained in the draft resolution.

(d) Commodities (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.9/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on commodities (A/C.2/72/L.9/Rev.1)

22. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.9, Rev.1, submitted by Ecuador on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

23. **Mr. Kimmel** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation regretted that it could not join consensus on the text and wished to highlight its concerns. Portions of the draft resolution that made obsolete references to the world financial and economic crisis, attributed supposed negative impacts on economic and social development to vague and sweeping references to some trade practices and trade barriers, and inappropriately called upon international financial institutions and other non-United Nations organizations to take actions that went beyond the scope of what such a resolution should properly address.

24. Regarding the ninth preambular paragraph, the United States recognized that Governments wished to pursue policies that contributed to the food security of their populations. To be successful, such policies should be consistent with the relevant international rules and obligations. His country had consistently supported many important goals of African Union Agenda 2063, most recently, at the African Union Commission/United States High-Level Dialogue held on 16 November in Washington D.C. That agenda included goals such as access to and quality of education, investing in infrastructure, protecting the environment, strengthening democracy and the rule of law and many other worthy initiatives shared by both Africa and the United States. However, his country was concerned by language committing to a reduction in food imports, which could have a negative impact on food security and might not be consistent with trade obligations of African members of the World Trade Organization, and hoped to hold further discussions with the African Union on that issue.

25. The United States was unable to support calls in the fourteenth and twentieth preambular paragraphs for regulatory measures to address price volatility or measures that would attempt to regulate commodity markets to the extent that such calls opened the door to protectionist trade barriers and subsidies. Nonetheless, the United States supported a call for improved access to market information to aid in good governance and better policy. His country was also unable to support the blanket call, in paragraph 3, to support policy efforts to address trade and market mispricing. The underlying supply and demand factors could provide effective pricing determination in the market. Such policy efforts could be inappropriately aimed at national governmental authorities that sought to artificially set prices or establish market-distorting price barriers. Any such efforts should be consistent with international rules and obligations.

26. In paragraph 5, the United States could not support blaming tariffs and WTO- consistent non-tariff measures for impeding the economic diversification of certain countries. In addition, any list of factors should include the effects of exchange rates and unfavourable business environments for commerce and investment. In paragraph 8, the United States was confused by the reference to excessive price volatility. As that term was not defined, Committee members should not be asked to support a call to address it. Moreover, policies aimed at

facilitating value addition should be consistent with relevant international rules and obligations.

27. The United States was unable to join consensus on language that spoke to ongoing and future work at the World Trade Organization that reinterpreted World Trade Organization agreements and decisions or that undermined the mandate of the World Trade Organization, which was an independent organization with a different membership, mandate and rules of procedure. Consistent with that policy, the United States could not accept paragraphs 15, 16 and 22. Paragraph 15 attempted to shape the agenda of the World Trade Organization, which was the exclusive responsibility of WTO members. Paragraph 16 inaccurately reflected the state of the Doha Development Round negotiations. World Trade Organization members at the Tenth Ministerial Conference had not affirmed the Doha Round and were no longer negotiating under its framework. Nor would his country accept the call of the United Nations for certain countries to provide market access. The United Nations had no voice on that matter. Furthermore, the United States could not accept the language in paragraph 22 that inappropriately elevated the accession processes of commodity-dependent developing countries over those of other applicants to the World Trade Organization. It was not appropriate for the United Nations to opine on the process for accession to an independent organization. Moreover, while the United States was active in the Aid for Trade initiative and supported it; the United Nations should not opine on the priorities of the WTO Aid for Trade initiative, which were set by that organization's members.

28. Finally, regarding the draft resolution's references to the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, his country had expressed its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November. The United States did not recognize the term "implementation target"; it understood that the targets were Sustainable Development Goal targets.

29. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.9/Rev.1 was adopted by 177 votes to 1, with no abstentions.*

31. **Ms. Stoeva** (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, said that the States members of the European Union had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The European Union and its member States attached the greatest importance to the development and strengthening of the multilateral trading system centred

around the World Trade Organization that was open, transparent, universal and rules-based. Only such a system fostered coherence among trade policies across the globe and allowed regional and bilateral initiatives to be mutually supportive in advancing a progressive trade agenda and the economic development of its members, especially developing countries. For that reason, it fully supported the trade-related language contained in the draft resolution.

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.27 and A/C.2/72/L.48)

Draft resolutions on the follow-up to and implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway and the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (A/C.2/72/L.27 and A/C.2/72/L.48)

32. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.48, submitted by Ms. Louis (Saint Lucia), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.27. Conference room paper CRP.22 contained the language agreed to by delegations on pending text in the draft resolution. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.48, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.22, was adopted.*

34. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.27 was withdrawn.*

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.26 and A/C.2/72/L.69)

Draft resolutions on the protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind (A/C.2/72/L.26 and A/C.2/72/L.69)

35. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A.C.2.72/L/69, submitted by Ms. Louis (Saint Lucia), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.26. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

36. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.69 was adopted.*

37. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that climate change was a complex global challenge. While joining consensus on the draft resolution, his delegation wished to clarify several points. The United States was continuing to review and develop its policies with respect to climate change. The language on climate change contained in the draft resolution and other draft resolutions adopted during the current session was without prejudice to evolving United States positions. The draft resolution's references to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and climate change, the United States had expressed its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November. On 4 August, the United States had communicated to the United Nations treaty depositary its intent to withdraw from the Paris Agreement as soon as it was eligible to do so, consistent with the terms of the Agreement, unless the President of the United States could to identify suitable terms for re-engagement. References to provisions of the United Nations Framework Agreement on Climate Change or the Paris Agreement and decisions by their parties did not change or interpret the meaning or applicability of those instruments and decisions. As a global leader in innovation, the United States stood ready to continue working with others on that important issue.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.26 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 20: Implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements and on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.36 and A/C.2/72/L.67)

Draft resolutions on implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements and on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (A/C.2/72/L.36 and A/C.2/72/L.67)

39. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.67, submitted by the, Ms. Chanda (Zambia), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.36. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

40. **Ms. Chanda** (Zambia), facilitator, said that paragraph 6 had been carefully negotiated and crafted, but that several corrections needed to be made to the

final version. A few lines into the paragraph, the wording should now be "different options for strengthening Member States" oversight, including but not limited to". There were further minor drafting changes in the remainder of that paragraph. The original version of the draft resolution should be used. She took it that there was now a clearer direction for further work on the elements and details, which would be conducted in Nairobi. She encouraged Committee members to follow those discussions in order to prepare for follow-up in the next session.

41. *Draft resolution L.67, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

42. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.36 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.11/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence (A/C.2/72/L.11/Rev.1)

43. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.11/Rev.1, submitted by Ecuador on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

44. **Ms. Christian** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her country was unable to join consensus on such a deeply problematic text and that other countries should share the concerns of the United States on issues that should trouble all Member States committed to the preservation of fundamental civil and political rights and genuine economic freedom. Her delegation had addressed its concerns regarding the draft resolution's references to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda in a general statement delivered on 17 November.

45. The United States was unable to accept the references whereby the General Assembly would seek to shape or influence the agenda of the World Trade Organization or suggest a need to strengthen coherence and cooperation between that organization and other independent organizations to attain priorities of the United Nations. The priorities and objectives of the World Trade Organization, an independent organization with a different membership, mandate, rules and procedures from the United Nations, were set by members of the World Trade Organization. Her country did not accept the voice of the United Nations in calling for greater coherence and coordination among those independent organizations. Such decisions should be left to the members of those organizations.

46. The United States also objected to any attempt to interpret the language of the eighth preambular paragraph to promote State ownership in the economy or to suggest that Governments could deprive private interests of wealth or resources without compensation that was in accordance with international law or might otherwise fail to observe a State's legal obligations. Regarding the tenth preambular paragraph , members should work towards a global economy that was free and fair. In that vein, more efforts should be made to fight unfair trade practices, including dumping, discriminatory non-tariff barriers, forced technology transfers, non-economic capacity, industrial subsidies and other support by Governments and other related institutions that distorted markets. The United Nations could not join consensus on the reference to inward-looking policies and protectionism. WTO-consistent trade-remedy measures and enforcement actions taken to protect economies from the unfair market-distorting practices of others were not protectionism. The United States did not advocate protectionism. However, it saw no utility in reaffirming stale calls to avoid protectionism, a pledge that others routinely violated with impunity. Her country could not support the General Assembly committing itself to strengthening regional trade agreements. That was a matter for the parties to each regional trade agreement to decide. The United Nations was not a forum for regional trade agreements or negotiations.

47. The United States could not join consensus on language that promoted technology transfer that was not on mutually agreed terms and voluntary. To the United States, any such language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States would continue to oppose language that undermined intellectual property rights. Finally, the draft resolution offered an additional example of one Member State's attempt to impose its national view of multilateralism and world geopolitics on the international system. The United States could not support such language but looked forward to working with others in the months and years ahead to sustain and strengthen the international norms on which the global system was based.

48. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

49. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.11/Rev.1 was adopted by 179 votes to 1, with no abstentions.*

50. **Ms. Stoeva** (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, said that the States members of the European Union had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The European Union and its member States attached the greatest importance to the development and strengthening of the multilateral trading system centred around the World Trade Organization that was open, transparent, universal and rules-based. Only such a system fostered coherence among trade policies across the globe and allowed regional and bilateral initiatives to be mutually supportive in advancing a progressive trade agenda and the economic development of its members, especially developing countries. For that reason, the European Union and its member States fully supported the trade-related language contained in the draft resolution.

(c) Culture and sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.13/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on culture and sustainable development (A/C.2/72/L.13/Rev.1)

51. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.13/Rev.1, submitted by Ecuador on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested.

52. **Ms. Christian** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the United States remained committed to the preservation of cultural heritage worldwide and recognized that culture could contribute to inclusive, sustainable economic and social development. However, her country had serious concerns about the draft resolution. The United States could not, for example, accept a reference to the repatriation of cultural property without acknowledging the rights of indigenous peoples concerning access to and repatriation of their ceremonial objects and human remains. Her country expected that principle to be shared by many States that, like the United States, supported the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

53. Likewise, the United States could not support conflating the protection of cultural property against trafficking with the application of intellectual property rights to the creation of new cultural products for the

market. The United States was also unable to join consensus on paragraph 11 (e), as it was not a party to the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, and had voted against it because of its flawed approach to issues related to that paragraph. There was no international consensus on the meaning of "cultural misappropriation". For that reason, the United States was unable to join consensus on paragraphs 11 (h) and 11 (i).

54. With respect to paragraph 13, the United States was unable to join consensus on language that called on independent international organizations and other countries to support the efforts of certain countries to consolidate their cultures and cultural industries. If domestic authorities pursued such efforts, it should be done in a manner consistent with relevant international rules and obligations. Generally speaking, the United States supported the efforts of other countries to improve the environment for competition, investment and free and fair reciprocal trade.

55. The United States also could not support language in the draft resolution that sought to support technology transfer that was not on mutually agreed terms and voluntary. For the United States, any such language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States would continue to oppose language that it believed undermined intellectual property rights. With regard to the draft resolution's references to the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and climate change, his country had expressed its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November.

56. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.13/Rev.1 was adopted by 181 votes to 2, with no abstentions.*

Agenda item 22: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.35 and A/C.2/72/L.62)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to the second United Nations Conference on Landlocked Developing Countries (A/C.2/72/L.35 and A/C.2/72/L.62)

58. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.72, submitted by Mr. Menelaou (Cyprus), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.35. Conference room paper CRP.17 contained the language agreed to by delegations

on pending text in the draft resolution. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

59. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.62, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.17, was adopted.*

60. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that with regard to the draft resolution's references to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the Paris Agreement and climate change, his country had expressed its concerns in a general statement delivered on 17 November. While the United States continued to develop its policies on climate change, the language on climate change contained in the draft resolution was without prejudice to its future positions. With respect to paragraph 24, the United States was confused by the urging of members to enhance technical and capacity-building assistance for the effective implementation of provisions of the Trade Facilitation Agreement. After reviewing the demand for such assistance, his country was not aware of any demonstrated need to enhance it. The United States also dissociated itself from paragraph 36, to the extent that such language could promote technology transfer that was not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. For his country, such language would have no standing in future negotiations. The United States would continue to oppose language that it believed undermined intellectual property rights.

61. Although the United States valued its participation in the Aid for Trade initiative, it regretfully had to dissociate itself from the language in paragraph 40, which suggested that the development partners had not yet effectively implemented the Aid for Trade initiative. Nor could it join consensus on language that provided guidance to World Trade Organization members on how to implement that initiative. His country did not disagree that the special needs and requirements listed in paragraph 40 were important for landlocked developing countries. However, those needs were not found in the Aid for Trade programme and could not be considered necessary for effective implementation of the initiative. The work programme was negotiated by World Trade Organization members. The United States did not recognize any attempts by the General Assembly to prescribe priorities for initiatives of the World Trade Organization, which was an independent institution with a different membership, mandate and rules of procedure. Furthermore, the United States could not join consensus on language that suggested that development partners should implement the Aid for Trade initiative differently for different groups of beneficiaries. The reference to international organizations in paragraph 41 did not include the World Trade Organization, whose agenda was set exclusively by the members of that organization. That was not a matter on which the General Assembly should opine.

62. **Mr. Naumkin** (Russian Federation) said that while his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it wished to clarify its position with respect to the eighteenth preambular paragraph, welcoming the outcome of the United Nations Conference to Support the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development. With regard to that paragraph and the reference to Sustainable Development Goal 14, the general understanding reached in the negotiations on the draft resolution was not reflected in the text just adopted.

63. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.35 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 23: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(b) Women in development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.21 and A/C.2/72/L.65)

Draft resolutions on women in development (A/C.2/72/L.21 and A/C.2/72/L.65)

64. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.65, submitted by Ms. Mele (Italy), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.21. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

65. **Ms. AlHashimi** (United Arab Emirates), facilitator, introduced four oral corrections to the draft resolution to align its language with what had been previously agreed: the fourteenth preambular paragraph should be deleted; the last three lines of the twenty-first preambular paragraph should read: "better understand the effects of natural disasters on women, as well as to reduce their vulnerability to natural disasters by increasing their access to information and facilitating more effective protection, assistance and evacuation measures"; in paragraph 22, "information and communications technology" should read "information and communications technologies" and the words "to eliminate gender inequalities at all levels" should be inserted after the comma following "new technologies"; and in paragraph 35 "technology" should be changed to "technologies".

66. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.65, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

67. **Monsignor Grysa** (Observer for the Holy See) reaffirmed the commitment of the Holy See to the promotion, protection and full realization of the human rights and integral human development of women. The dignity of women must be respected, defended and properly addressed. Although the Holy See welcomed the purpose and general intention of the draft resolution, it was concerned about the attempt to shift the focus of the document away from the integral human development of women to highly controversial issues within the remit of other General Assembly Committees. It did not consider abortion or access to abortifacients to be a dimension of sexual and reproductive health care. It was also deeply concerned about elements of paragraph 17; access to sexual and reproductive health should be age-appropriate and should not be extended to boys and girls without deferring to the primary responsibility and prior rights of parents - including the right to religious freedom - in the upbringing and development of their children. Those rights were enshrined, inter alia, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Paragraph 17 was based on the language of General Assembly resolution 65/277 on HIV and AIDS, which included a sovereignty clause that was missing from the draft resolution. His delegation therefore dissociated itself from that paragraph. Lastly, the Holy See understood the term "gender" to be grounded in the biological sexual identity and difference, not in a psychological state, and it should not be interpreted as a social construction.

68. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his country had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. However, with regard to the text's references to the 2030 development agenda, the Paris Agreement, climate change and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, his delegation had expressed its concerns in a statement delivered on 17 November. His delegation also wished to underscore its disagreement with other inaccurate language in the draft resolution. For example, its sixteenth preambular paragraph referred to a world financial and economic crisis even though there was no longer any such crisis. Using that term detracted attention from important and relevant challenges to economic stability which, unfortunately, the draft resolution failed to mention. The right to development, also referred to in the preamble, lacked any agreed international meaning and further work was needed to make any such right consistent with Member States' obligations to promote and protect fundamental human rights, including civil and political rights. Any related discussion must focus on aspects of development that related to human rights, which were universal and which every individual could demand his or her own Government to respect.

69. The draft resolution also referred to universal access to affordable and high-quality health care. States did not have obligations to achieve universal access to health care. His delegation encouraged Governments and public institutions to strive to improve access to high-quality universal health care, and to do so in accordance with their national contexts and policies. The United States would continue to work to improve access to high-quality health care while also recognizing the necessary role of partnerships with the private sector and other non-governmental stakeholders. Women should have equal access to health care. His Government remained committed to the principles laid out in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development. There had been an international consensus that those documents did not create new international rights, including any right to abortion. His Government fully supported the principle of voluntary choice regarding maternal and child health and family planning. It did not recognize abortion as a method of family planning, nor did it support abortion in its reproductive health assistance. The United States was the world's largest donor of bilateral reproductive health and family planning assistance.

70. With respect to the reference to "full employment" in the preamble, its understanding was that that term referred to the importance of productive employment, given that full employment referred to the state of an economy rather than to individuals. His Government's position with respect to the temporary special measures mentioned in paragraph 29 was that each country must determine for itself whether such measures were appropriate. Often, the best way to improve the situation of women and girls was through legal and policy reforms that ended discrimination against them and promoted equality of opportunity.

71. **Ms. Stoeva** (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union would continue to be a strong and steady supporter of the human rights of women and girls, and of equality between the sexes. Gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls were essential preconditions for equitable and inclusive sustainable development, in addition to being important values and objectives in themselves. In that

regard, the European Union had welcomed additions that had brought the draft resolution into closer alignment with the 2030 Agenda and with Goal 5 of the Sustainable Development Goals in particular. The text now included a reference to child, early and forced marriage, and to female genital mutilation. It had also given more prominence to eliminating all forms of violence against women, and to addressing sexual harassment and discrimination in the world of work.

72. She welcomed the inclusion in the draft resolution of such issues as unpaid care and domestic work, and equal pay for equal work or for work of equal value, as well as its recognition of men and boys as strategic partners, allies, agents and beneficiaries of change for the achievement of gender equality. However, the European Union wished that target 5.6 of the Goals ("Ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights as agreed in accordance with the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Platform for Action and the outcome documents of their review conferences") had been properly reflected in the draft resolution in order to provide a more consistent and comprehensive reflection of the aims and goals of the 2030 Agenda. She reaffirmed the commitment of the European Union to the promotion, protection and fulfilment of the right of all individuals to have full control over, and to decide responsibly on, matters related to their sexuality and sexual and reproductive health free from discrimination, coercion or violence. Those matters were integral to the broader issues of women in development.

73. **Ms. Mamdani** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and Switzerland, expressed strong concern that negotiated language on gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls consistently failed to acknowledge the full array of actions which the international community had collectively committed to undertake in its pursuit of global sustainable development. While the draft resolution addressed the topic of women in development, some delegations had sought to prevent the inclusion of key issues of the 2030 Agenda, including sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights, on the grounds that they should be addressed solely by the Third Committee. Her delegation, Australia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and Switzerland disagreed completely with that argument. Not only did the 2030 Agenda explicitly state the crucial role of gender equality in achieving sustainable development, but the Agenda as a whole sought to break down silos and recognize the links between all of the sustainable development issues outlined in its Sustainable Development Goals and targets.

74. Despite extensive efforts to achieve gender equality, women, girls and adolescents continued to be subjected to discrimination, violence and harmful practices, and denied the full realization of their human rights, including their right to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health. Women's, girls' and adolescents' autonomy to decide freely on their sexual and reproductive health and rights was often undermined by harmful sociocultural norms, age barriers and third-party consent requirements and restrictions. Consequently, they could not gain access to the information they needed to make healthy decisions or to the health services needed to carry out their choices. Just over half of women worldwide were making their own decisions about consensual sexual relations and the use of contraception and health services. In addition, progress was still much too slow in other critical areas, such as combating violence against women and girls. Gender equality and sustainable development could not be achieved if those issues were not meaningfully addressed. Target 5.6 of the Sustainable Development Goals explicitly stated the need to ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights. In order to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of girls, that could not be overlooked.

75. In the course of negotiations on the draft resolution on women in development and several other draft resolutions under consideration by the Second Committee, deliberations had been reduced to long arguments over which previously agreed language could and could not be included. Delegations should instead be using their time to engage in substantive discussions on how to make progress on critical aspects of the 2030 Agenda, which would help ensure the ongoing relevance of the Committee.

76. **Ms. Loe** (Norway) said that achieving gender equality was at the centre of her country's domestic and foreign policies and fundamental in all of its development efforts. There was a direct link between socioeconomic development and increased opportunities available to women and girls, the promotion of their right to self-determination and the furthering of their empowerment. If the Sustainable Development Goals were to be achieved, gender equality must be at the heart of the international community's efforts. She welcomed additions that had been made to the draft resolution, including those that aligned its language with the most ambitious gender equality commitments of the 2030 Agenda, and those that concerned sexual harassment and discrimination in

the workplace, equal pay for equal work or work of equal value, and strategic partnerships with men and boys to achieve those commitments. However, her delegation regretted that target 5.6 of the Sustainable Development Goals was not included in the draft resolution.

77. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.21 was withdrawn.*

(c) Human resources development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.20 and A/C.2/72/L.64)

Draft resolutions on human resources development (A/C.2/72/L.20 and A/C.2/72/L.64)

78. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.64, submitted by Ms. Mele (Italy), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.20. He also drew the attention of the Committee to conference room paper CRP.23, containing the language agreed upon by delegations with regard to pending text in draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.64. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

79. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.64, as revised by the text contained in conference room paper CRP.23, was adopted.*

80. **Ms. Stoeva** (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that, while the European Union had joined the consensus, it deemed that the draft resolution did not set any precedent or deviate from the only legal interpretation possible of the term "States" in its paragraphs 8 and 16. United Nations resolutions were addressed to Member States. The European Union was particularly disappointed that, even though an opinion had been put forward during the no-objection procedure, it had proved impossible to arrive at a satisfactory compromise on whether to employ the term "States" or "Member States". That lack of compromise diminished the relevance of the draft resolution, which the European Union had otherwise been prepared to support fully. In order to ensure that that legal issue would not become a political problem in future, the European Union called on the next Chair of the Second Committee to be vigilant so as to avoid the undue polarization of the Committee by issues that were not within its mandate.

81. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that his delegation had addressed its concerns regarding the draft resolution's references to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda in a general statement delivered on 17 November. Regarding the reference in paragraph 15 to "boosting national economic performance", the United States recognized that every Government had an interest in boosting its economic performance. That would be best achieved by working to improve the environment for competition, investment, and free, fair and reciprocal trade, while always respecting relevant international rules and obligations. His Government dissociated itself from paragraphs 21, 22 and 26 to the extent that they could promote technology transfer that was not mutually agreed and voluntary. The United States continued to oppose language that undermined intellectual property rights. It also concurred with the statement of the European Union on the draft resolution.

82. **Ms. Rivard** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia, said that while their delegations had chosen to join consensus, they wished to emphasize that they firmly believed in respecting the procedure of the General Assembly and its Main Committees to address Member States in its resolutions. Their position was that alternative language should be carefully presented and considered on a case-by-case basis with a supporting rationale and an assessment of the possible implications of changing the wording of the term "Member States" in a given context. In addition, they were concerned at the procedure used for the draft resolution, which had not reverted back to agreed language in the absence of consensus during negotiations, even though the affected paragraphs had remained otherwise untouched. That approach, which had enjoyed the support of the Bureau, had been employed on numerous occasions during negotiations in 2017. In the draft resolution just adopted, however, small yet impactful changes had been made to agreed language from resolution 70/220, notably in paragraphs 2, 14, 15, 19 and 21, without discussion or the presentation of a clear rationale for those changes. Canada and Australia did not consider that language to be the basis for future negotiations.

83. **Ms. Fisher-Tsin** (Israel) said that her delegation had joined consensus on the draft resolution because it believed, as stated in the draft resolution itself, that human resources development was an essential part of economic, social and environmental development, and was vital to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Israel had been disappointed to discover, however, that the zero draft of the resolution had contained politicized text that had aimed not only to change the mandate of the United Nations, but also to undermine the rights and obligations of its Member States. Although her delegation, as well as many others, had expressed its strong objection to the inclusion of that problematic language in the text, some of it remained in place. It was unfortunate that some delegations preferred to politicize the text instead of

focusing on the important matter at hand. The language adopted represented an ad hoc compromise under specific circumstances and should not be considered as a basis for future negotiations.

84. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.20 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(b) South-South cooperation for development (*continued*) (A/C.2/72/L.43 and A/C.2/72/L.68)

Draft resolutions on South-South Cooperation (A/C.2/72/L.43 and A/C.2/72/L.68)

85. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.68, submitted by Ms. Chanda (Zambia), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.43. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

86. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.68 was adopted.*

87. **Mr. Lawrence** (United States of America) said that over the years, the United States, working together with other Member States, had provided support to United Nations entities for their good work in facilitating cooperation among developing countries, which the United Nations referred to as South-South cooperation. His Government had also voiced serious concerns about wrongdoings associated with the South-South cooperation work of the United Nations. It had called on the Secretary-General and senior managers to take the necessary actions to remedy them and to strengthen management oversight to prevent them from recurring. While the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Office of South-South Cooperation had taken steps in that regard, some Member States' resistance to addressing those issues in a forthright way - such as by calling on the Secretary-General to work on the reform plan with the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations — had seriously undermined Member States' collective oversight responsibility. His Government reiterated its call for the Secretary-General, in line with his reform mandate, to lead a comprehensive review and reform of United Nations entities involved in South-South cooperation work in order to strengthen their transparency, accountability, oversight and effectiveness.

88. In addition, his Government dissociated itself from the parts of paragraphs 14, 21 and 29 dealing with technology transfer to the extent that such language could promote technology transfer that was not voluntary and on mutually agreed terms. For the United States, any such language would have no standing in future negotiations and it opposed language that could undermine intellectual property rights. His delegation had addressed its concerns regarding the resolution's references to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement in a general statement delivered on 17 November.

89. *Draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.43 was withdrawn.*

90. **Ms. Engelbrecht Schadtler** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) pointed out that her delegation had previously presented reservations and position statements about some aspects of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and said that it wished to reiterate those reservations and positions in respect of all the draft resolutions adopted by the Committee during the current session.

Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

91. **The Chair** recalled the process undertaken in 2016 on the review of the Committee's agenda and working methods, which had culminated in a report by the Chair of the Committee at the seventieth session. That process had not produced a formal outcome; however a broad agreement had been reached on a number of points, in particular relating to working methods. Together with the other members of the Bureau, he had initiated preparations for the current session, including agreement on a programme of work at an early stage, reducing the number of side events, organizing the general discussion of all items in the first four weeks of the session and identifying facilitators in a timely manner. During the session, he had strictly enforced the agreed time limits during the general debate and general discussions of individual agenda items, thereby reducing the number of meetings. That included a new measure whereby microphones were switched off when speakers had exceeded the time limit by more than one minute.

92. The Committee had set realistic deadlines for the submission of draft resolutions, including staggered deadlines for drafts under item 19, and had allowed more time for the submission of draft resolutions following the general discussion of items 17 and 18. Only in the case of the draft resolution on Agenda 21 had it been necessary to extend the deadline, which had been done with the agreement of the Bureau. All draft resolutions had been submitted in accordance with the agreed deadlines.

93. The conclusion of the Committee's work on 30 November, after having been granted only one extension by the plenary, was one of the earliest concluding dates for the Committee in recent history, and he commended all delegations for that shared accomplishment. While negotiations had been challenging in light of various reform initiatives that had had an impact upon consultations on key proposals, a positive atmosphere had prevailed among delegations during the current session. Of the 42 draft proposals adopted, 12 (i.e., 28.5 per cent) had been adopted by recorded vote. While that represented an increase over previous sessions, it was positive that a large majority of drafts had been adopted by consensus, a tradition which was important to preserve.

94. With regard to the revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, he recalled paragraphs 26, 28 and 30 of Assembly resolution 71/323 on trimming the Committee's agenda, reducing overlap with the Third Committee and the Economic and Social Council, and addressing gaps and duplication, respectively. The President of the General Assembly, in his address to the Committee on 9 October, had referred to the ongoing agenda alignment process and to his intention to work closely with the Chairs of the Main Committees, the President of the Economic and Social Council and the General Committee to explore aligning the agendas of the relevant bodies with the 2030 Agenda. That process aimed to enhance synergies and coherence across the work of the plenary, Main Committees and Economic and Social Council, and to reduce overlap.

Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-third session of the General Assembly (A/C.2/72/L.70)

95. **The Chair** drew attention to the draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-third session of the General Assembly, contained in document A/C.2/72/L.70. The draft programme of work contained no programme budget implications. He took it that the Committee wished to approve the draft programme of work.

96. *The draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-third session of the General Assembly was adopted.*

Completion of the Committee's work

97. **Mr. Gass** (Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs), speaking on behalf of Mr. Liu Zhenmin, Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, said that Member States' skilful work and spirit of cooperation were fundamental to the success of the Committee's deliberations and to the full achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

98. Science, technology, innovation and globalization had brought extraordinary benefits to the world, but they had also contributed to inequality and unsustainability. Many people around the world were mired in poverty, and progress in achieving gender equality was much too slow. Additionally, climate change posed an increasing threat to people's livelihoods, and efforts to address it and adapt to it were still fairly recent. Those challenges were addressed in the 2030 Agenda, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement, which were blueprints for ensuring environmental sustainability and more inclusive and equitable globalization while creating long-term conditions for peaceful, resilient and prosperous societies. Achieving sustainable development and ending extreme poverty could not happen without strengthening multilateralism. He noted the Secretary-General's emphasis on achieving those goals by working as a team.

99. The Secretariat stood ready to provide the Committee with the support necessary to follow up on the 2017 session and assist with implementation efforts. It would ensure that the mandates emanating from the seventy-second session would be duly fulfilled, and that lessons learned from the session were considered.

100. In 2017, the contribution of science and technology to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals had been a common theme of the Committee's three official side events and its annual joint meeting with the Economic and Social Council. He was delighted that the efforts of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs to support the Bureau during those events - one of which had showcased Sophia, a humanoid robot - had been well received.

101. He noted the Committee's emphasis on the importance of integrated and coordinated policy approaches at all levels. Full use must be made of the interlinked and mutually reinforcing pillars of the United Nations development system. The Department of Social and Economic Affairs was taking those directives into account in order to become more transparent, better coordinated and stronger, and it looked forward to assisting the Committee in ensuring that the United Nations made the best possible use of its resources in the service of humanity.

102. **The Chair** thanked the Committee for its fruitful work and commitment during its seventy-second session. Guided by the principles of efficiency, equality and empathy, he had trusted that a focused schedule could improve the Committee's own focus on its vital

tasks, and indeed it had completed its work for the year unusually early without sacrificing a consensus-based approach.

103. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement represented an ambitious promise to shape a better world for every human being, leaving no one behind. Implementing those agreements, however, remained a challenge. While trying to find their way forward, the peoples of the world had perhaps focused too much on their differences and too little on their commonalities. It was crucial to maintain a functioning Second Committee in order to implement those landmark agreements. To that end, the Committee had adopted working practices based on transparency and dialogue, with clear and strict schedules, while seeking constructive means to reach compromises that could be acceptable to most, if not all.

104. He thanked the members of the Bureau, the Second Committee secretariat, his colleagues in the Permanent Mission of Estonia, the facilitators of the draft resolutions and the group coordinators, and congratulated the Member States on the conclusion of a historic session.

105. *The Chair declared that the Committee had completed its work for the seventy-second session.*

The meeting rose at noon.